

Docket No. 000742C1

Serial No. 10/613,625

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached five (5) sheets of drawings replace original sheets 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9.

These drawing sheets include changes to the only the legends of Figs. 4, 5A, 5B, 7, and 8. Specifically, the legends of Figs. 4, 5A, 5B, and 7 have been relocated higher on the sheet in order to prevent cutting off a portion, and the legend of Fig. 8 has been amended to indicate prior art.

Marked-up sheets are not being submitted separately because the amendments are straightforward and explained clearly herein, and no changes have been made to the substance of the drawings,

Attachment(s): 5 Replacement Sheet(s), marked "Replacement Sheet"

Docket No. 000742C1

Serial No. 10/613,625

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-18 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended or added.

This amendment and remarks fully address the Examiner's office action, and accordingly claims 1-18 are now presented for examination and allowance.

Submission of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner noted that references listed in the specification do not constitute an information disclosure statement. Applicant has prepared and filed an information disclosure statement citing those references, and requests consideration of those references.

Summary of amendments to specification

Amendments to paragraphs [0025] and [0030] of the specification have been made to correct clerical errors that appeared in the application as published. No new matter has been added; support for the amendments is found throughout the application.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figs. 4, 5, 5A, and 7 for lack of labels indicating the number of the Figures.

Applicant believes that these labels were partially cut-off during copying or scanning, and therefore are due to a clerical error.

In response, applicant submits amended drawing pages showing the complete figure labels for those figures. No new matter has been added; support for the amendments is clearly found in the application as filed.

Also, the Examiner objected to Figs. 2-3 and 7-8, suggesting that they be designated by a legend such as ---Prior Art---. In response, applicant has amended the legend of Fig. 8 and submits the following remarks.

Docket No. 000742C1**Serial No. 10/613,625**

Applicant has reviewed these drawings, and believes that only Fig. 8 should be labeled --Prior Art--, and has amended the Fig. 8 legend accordingly. The other drawings (Figs. 2, 3, and 7) show embodiments in which the claimed invention is implemented, and therefore cannot properly be labeled prior art.

Particularly, Fig. 2 shows an example of a mobile cellular communication station in which the claimed invention can be implemented (e.g., see claims 16-18). Fig. 3, shows an example of a cellular basestation in which the claimed invention can be implemented (e.g., see claims 11-15), and Fig. 7 shows an example of a location server in which the claimed invention can be implemented (e.g., see claim 4).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected the Brief Description, suggesting that it be amended to indicate the Figures that are known in the art. In response, applicant has amended paragraph 23 to indicate that Fig. 8 is prior art, corresponding to the legend added (and discussed above).

The Examiner also objected to the abstract "because it does not refer to the claimed invention". In response, applicant has amended the abstract to more closely follow the claims; particularly, portions of the previous abstract were deleted, and then claim language from claims 1 and 2 was copied into the abstract and modified to fit into a proper abstract format. No new matter has been added; support for the amendments is clearly found in the application (and specifically in claims 1 and 2) as filed.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Double patenting

Claims 1-18 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,541 to Krasner et al.

Docket No. 000742C1

Serial No. 10/613,625

In response, applicant submits the attached terminal disclaimer, thereby overcoming the double patenting rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this Application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2006

By: 

James D. McFarland
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,544

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779
Telephone: (858) 651-8840
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502